On the “AI democratizes art” argument, on arguments based on perceived “elitism”, and on grifters, scammers, etc. And a last warning.

I stated on the first essay that I won’t bother explaining why the argument is flawed from the start. (✏) However, this specifically tries to focus on the perceived elitism from those who make higher quality art, or on similar arguments.

While it’s true that high quality art will always be a status symbol, there will be those who try to make it more accessible to the masses, or at least create some lower-quality product resembling it (masstige): and this *might* seem to be one of the intentions of those who developed generative AI content.

Now, nobody is arguing that art fits the definition of a luxury, but this does not mean that it’s expensive, or that you can’t make it yourself, or that it’s not accessible. **You can’t just expect everyone to draw for free for you forever, I already explained** it’s no different from any other job in the first essay, as well as alternatives.

Back to the argument that AI will make high quality art accessible to the masses. It doesn’t change that the process for making high quality art is difficult by itself. Sure, pencil drawings can look nice, but the precise line work, accurate shading, etc. still takes effort. Does that mean that a machine should do it? No! Skill is relevant yes, but it did not come out of nothing! And do you thing they don’t matter either? Let’s not forget that **the human connection is what matters**. I don’t want to repeat the previous essays. I don’t know about economics, but **I doubt you can make high quality art (or something that imitates it) more affordable without automating what makes it art in the first place**, that it was created by a *human being*. But pretty sure you can afford this: ✏and that’s step one.

That’s the only thing I ask for in the meantime, if you think art should be something only a human can make. If not, keep reading.

Now, on skill and effort: if you can write a prompt, that’s enough! *Imagine it and/or let others imagine it*. Psych! Now, if you think effort isn’t what matters, then you don’t understand what’s it like to make something like what you’re reading. That tells me you only care about the end result, which tells me what kind of person you are. I don’t want to discuss it more than what I already did. But, think about it, **maybe you’re part of the problem**. You want instant gratification, with no thoughts on what makes this wicked technology work. No thoughts about the workers who put all their soul on the end product.

Now, on grifters and those who think of getting rich with AI. While I understand more or less with the situation right now, think about the consequences. Think of what you’re doing do culture, to humanity as a whole. You’re helping, whether you want it or not, the companies that do some of the worst things you can think to humanity as a whole. If you don’t have the time to think about that, shame on you. You will be complicit in the destruction of everything that

you love, **including what makes you, you.** And the very person who is writing this. Think of what you will do once you completely rely on an AI for everything, anything resembling (no; a mockery of) a human connection, including your AI generated “art”. Think what happens when you reach the point that **you, yourself, and your loved ones, are no longer needed.** And yes, that’s almost certainly going to happen. As if that wasn’t like, the goal from the beginning. Destroying the very basis for the AI you use, (how do you think it was created?). Destroy every human connection. **Destroy what makes us human.**

If even that does not convince you enough, you actually need help, if you somehow figure out that you’re part of the problem, whether you want to be or not. Seriously. **It’s not my job to rehabilitate criminals**. And yes, you’re a criminal if you commit **fraud**. But if you’re a real human being, but actually need that money, see what else you can do. AI might seem like an easy way out, but think if there are more ethical options. If for some reason, this is the only option you have to make a living, then how the heck can you afford the computer and/or access to the internet?! Even if you still have to go to internet cafés in 2026, how can you afford that? I’m not saying you shouldn’t get rich, but what would it feel like if you yourself got scammed?! If someone scammed you and you lost a lot of your money? Even if that was the only option to lift yourself out of poverty, think about what else you could’ve done, before this was invented. Did your parents or older relatives try anything before you? I still don’t know how to describe it to you. AI, in the long term, is possibly one of the worst things you could do. **You’re helping in the destruction of the very essence of humanity, of your own kind.**

Now, onto something else, but on ones who are in a similar situation. It’s unfortunate how the situation is for those who train the AI. And yes, the AI you’re using relies on the labor not only of practically all artists and creators whose work has ever been on the internet, but also the work of those who label the data. And these are the ones that I can’t speak of, because they live in countries such as Kenya, but they are forced to watch the most horrible things you can imagine, just so that certain content is not visible to the AI users. Which I won’t discuss it here. These folk see themselves as heroes, but at a high price. If only they realized the impact of the tech. But, it’s not my job to discuss this in depth, am not in the position to argue about the evil behind this with people who live in a separate country and with different incomes, of whom I have no contact or knowledge of. Yet **I consider this one of the most important yet not as widely discussed aspects of AI. Unfortunately, in-depth discussion of the subject matter, as well as on the situation of the data labelers and their job, and their (possibly unwitting) participation in this purely evil industry, is outside the scope of this essay.**

“But all of that is just because of capitalism, not AI itself”. True. But this is just a distraction or a red herring from the *immediate* threat not only to everyone’s careers, but to our humanity, our culture. Complaining about “capitalism” is

fine, but what can you do right now? I'm not saying to do nothing, but this statement ignores context. Even then, this is misleading. I already said something about it on the previous essay.

Now on these arguments: "But it's not AI itself, it's just the bad actors who are the problem". Then let's ignore that it's almost as if the AI itself was tailor made for that very purpose: scamming, deceiving, replacing every human interaction. Why would the developers in the first place allow it to replicate perfectly something such as the essay you're reading? Perfectly recreate a photograph or a video? Make it super easy to fake any evidence, including behind the scenes content? And make all of that accessible to anyone with an internet connection? Who wanted this, other than a psychopath? "A knife can be a weapon and a cooking utensil". True. The thing is that it also depends on how accessible or easy it's to use. In this case, the target would be **reality itself**. Do you think it would be fine if every kitchen knife would only need you to tap on something to do serious damage? For a non-graphic example: imagine if one day, magically every kitchen knife suddenly could cut stone like you would cut bread. That's the only way your point can make sense. Not even the most malicious con artists would be capable of putting in that much effort to create a believable hoax. By your logic, there's no reason OpenAI should put in guardrails, even if they're barely enough.

"But ghostwriters/photoshopping/special effects already existed" OK, so does that make it better? You think it's fine to cheat for everything in life? And those things took effort. Those who used Photoshop almost always disclosed its usage, and knew and credited the source material used. They didn't create the source images seemingly out of thin air, and the original sources were easily found. SFX artists showed their workflow on behind-the-scenes content for a reason. Why did your favorite studios spend millions of dollars on it? An artist typically wouldn't present fiction as reality, unless they wanted to deceive others. And generative AI is suspiciously looking like it was made for these exact purposes, and for a far cheaper price. Why don't they even bother solving or at least mitigating the hallucination problem? They knew about it but went ahead anyway.

"But it looks cool!" "But you liked it!" This is a distraction of what the tech seems was almost tailor made to do, and will almost certainly produce in the future. **Which is eldritch horror, but in real life.** I already told you multiple reasons to stop using AI, just before, on this essay. If you only value a product by its final result, then I want you to think on this. Do you think it would be fine if everyone you grew up with, everyone who cared about you, everyone who helped you in your worst times, everyone who made your life better, (including those behind the art you consumed before 2022 or so), everyone who respected you, everyone you ever knew, turned out to only be machines? With no emotion? No spirit, no essence, no soul? **Nothing that makes us human?**

If you're still here and still think it's perfectly acceptable to misrepresent the production of anything you use, then the very fact that it will eventually kill off

what makes us human should basically end this argument. No matter what other technique of misleading customers does, this very technology overshadows every other excuse that could've been used in the past. Because it's making it so you never know what gave you joy was genuine. The intentions, the purpose, is gone. I was right now looking at the lo-fi hip hop content farms on YouTube. If these were actually run by human beings, however their intentions might be, none of the "soul" in these songs is theirs. Anything like a "soul" is actually just an aggregate of the emotional expression of the uncredited musicians whose work was used in the generation of the "music". Essentially, your AI's output is closer to what a psychopath would make. Superficial charm, but nothing underneath. No depth. But even that don't deserve to be compared to it. **It's not even an imitation, like I said in the first essay. It's a *mockery*. It's *desecration.* If you actually enjoy these, knowing it's AI, you don't deserve to enjoy real art.** Sorry about not saying that at first, but I literally couldn't find how to describe it. Being autistic doesn't help much.

Case study: The "1982 "cover"" of Predador de Perereca by MC Jhey, and "created" by BLOW RECORDS. A "disco" "cover" of a Brazilian funk song (a different genre from American funk) with very obscene lyrics. It's unfortunately catchy but it's just a mockery of the disco sound of bands such Earth Wind, & Fire and Kool & the Gang (their producer was a Brazilian!) (2). The overly dirty lyrics are just salt in the wound. Not even the disco (or post-disco) of the actual era was this overtly sexual, despite the overtones on a lot of songs. But it seems most people don't care. Even the associated meme phrase "Not my language not my problem" tells you.

"But all entertainment is fake". Yes, but the emotions and, intentions, everything they want to express with it are not. All of that gets thrown out of the window when you prompt your AI.

Look, I could go on and on about it, but this simply cannot be discussed like this forever. If you still have any trace of humanity left, tell anyone you know about this!

There is no easy way to fight back. I suspect that the goal is to actively suppress anything to fight back by taking everything we use against those who use the AI against us. This very essay and its collection are almost inevitably going to be trained on. So, maybe look up, as stated, subreddits such as r/ArtistHate for more information.

(1) Eumir Deodato - Wikipedia